

Serial No. 09/853,044  
Amdt. dated November 6, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of October 11, 2006

Docket No. CIT/K-0146

### **REMARKS**

By the present response, Applicants has amended claims 1, 9, 12 and 18 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-22 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, claims 1-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,014,164 (Woodgate et al.).

#### **35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections**

Claims 1-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Woodgate et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Woodgate et al. discloses a display for 3D images where left eye and right eye images of an autostereoscopic display are displayed on LCD spatial light modulators which are illuminated by movable light sources via converging lenses or mirrors. A tracking system tracks the position of an observer and a control system controls the positions of the light sources so that the microimages of the light sources formed by the lenses or mirrors track the observer. The observer thus sees the 3D image while having an enlarged degree of freedom of movement.

Regarding claims 1, 5, 7, 9 and 12, Applicants submit that Woodgate et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of these claims. For example, the Examiner asserts that Woodgate et al. discloses an apparatus displaying a three-dimensional

image which synthesizes an aspectogram comprising at least three two-dimensional microimages of a scene and regenerates them in a three-dimensional image of the scene, in Fig. 4 of Woodgate et al. However, this figure merely shows a diagram of a projection display apparatus where light from illuminators is specially modulated to form two 2D images that are then combined by a beam combiner 4, (see col. 4, lines 35-38), and that tilting of the observers head can be accommodated, in displays which do not use arrays of lenticules, by tilting each source of illumination, however, the image has to be modified in order to maintain the 3D autostereoscopic effect. This is not synthesizing an aspectogram comprising at least three two-dimensional microimages of a scene and regenerating them in a three-dimensional image of the scene, as recited in the claims of the present application. Woodgate et al. does not disclose or suggest these limitations in the claims of the present application.

Moreover, the Examiner asserts that Woodgate et al. discloses a compensator as recited in the claims of the present application, at col. 4, line 64-col. 5, line 9. However, these portions merely disclose that the position of the source of illumination may be moved vertically in correspondence with the movement of the observer and details regarding the tilting of the observers head and modifying the image in order to maintain the 3D autostereoscopic effect (as noted previously). This is not a compensator capable of adjusting a viewing zone of a three-dimensional image that is synthesized from the at least three two-dimensional microimages and compensating distortion of the three-dimensional image by manipulating the aspectogram in

accordance with a signal input from the detector, as recited in the claims of the present application. Woodgate et al. does not disclose or suggest a compensator receiving a signal input from the detector and capable of adjusting a viewing zone and compensating distortion of a three-dimensional image, as recited in the claims of the present application.

In addition, the Examiner asserts that Woodgate et al. discloses a microlens array for synthesizing the at least three two-dimensional microimages and regenerating them in a three-dimensional image of a scene, in Fig. 4. However, Applicants submit that this is an improper § 102 rejection in that the Examiner fails to specifically identify where in the cited reference each and every limitation is disclosed or suggested. Further, Fig. 4 in Woodgate et al. merely discloses spatial light modulators 1A and 1B, combiner 4, a projection lens 10, first and second lenticular screens 12 and 14, a diffuser 16, an illuminator 20 and spatial light modulator 22. This is not a microlens for synthesizing at least three two-dimensional microimages and regenerating them in a three-dimensional image of a scene, as recited in the claims of the present application. Woodgate et al. does not disclose or suggest a microlens array for synthesizing two-dimensional microimages, or a microlens array regenerating the microimages in a three-dimensional image of a scene.

Further, the Examiner asserts that Woodgate et al. discloses a viewing adjust engine for adjusting a viewing zone of the three-dimensional image by moving the at least three microimages in accordance with a signal input from the head position detector, at col. 4, line 64-

col. 5, line 9. However, as noted previously, these portions merely disclose that the position of the source of illumination may be moved vertically in accordance with the movement of the observer and that if the observer's head is tilted the image has to be modified in order to maintain the 3D autostereoscopic effect. This is not a viewing adjust engine for adjusting a viewing zone of the three-dimensional image by moving the at least three microimages in accordance with a signal input from the head position detector, as recited in the claims for the present application. Woodgate et al. does not disclose or suggest a viewing adjust engine. Further, Woodgate does not disclose or suggest a viewing adjust engine adjusting a viewing zone in accordance with a signal input from the head position detector. Woodgate et al. merely relates to moving the position of a source of illumination and tilting the source of illumination.

Regarding claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11 and 13-22, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 4, 7, 9, and 12 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Woodgate et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1-22 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Serial No. **09/853,044**  
Amdt. dated November 6, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of October 11, 2006

Docket No. **CIT/K-0146**

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-22 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim  
Registration No. 36,186  
Frederick D. Bailey  
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tlg  
**Date: November 6, 2006**  
\\Fk4\Documents\2016\2016-787\107068.doc

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**